

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Serial No. 09/806,393
Final OA Dated: April 9, 2007
Response dated: September 7, 2007

PATENT
PF980067

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 8-15 are pending in this application, and are rejected in the Final Office Action of April 9, 2007. No claim amendments are presented herein. However, a listing of all pending claims is included with this response for the Examiner's convenience.

Re: Claims 8-15

Claims 8-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,550,576 issued to Klosterman (hereinafter, "Klosterman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,530,939 issued to Mansfield, Jr., et al. (hereinafter, "Mansfield, Jr."). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

It is first noted that independent claims 8 and 15 recite:

"Process for managing service data in a television system in which the service data are transmitted, comprising a step of acquiring information containing a list of broadcast services and supplementary data relative to these services and of storing the acquired information in a first database of a receiver; wherein the process comprises the step of:

- copying information stored in the first database to a second database of the receiver for the updating of the second database, the second database having a same logical structure as the first database, wherein the copying stores data in the first database and the second database in an identical manner;

- making the data stored in the second database available to at least one application of the said receiver, and

- when the acquired list of broadcast services changes, of acquiring the new list of services in the first database, and of copying the acquired list of broadcast services to the second database **when the entire list has been acquired in the first database.**" (emphasis added; see claim 8), and

"Television receiver in a television system with transmission of service data, comprising:

'- means for acquiring information containing a list of broadcast service and supplementary data relative to these services;

'- means for storing information in a first service database;

'- means for copying the acquired list of broadcast services to a second database having a same structure as the first database;

'- detection means of a change of list of broadcast services, the detection means controlling the means for copying the list of broadcast services **when the entire list has been acquired in the first database;**

'wherein, the second database has a same logical structure as the first database, and the copying stores the acquired list of broadcast services stored in the first database in the second database in an identical manner as it is stored in the first database." (emphasis added; see claim 15)

As indicated, independent claims 8 and 15 respectively define a process for managing service data in a television system and a television receiver in a television system with transmission of service data. According to both claims, information containing a list of broadcast services and supplementary data relative to these services is acquired and stored in a first database. When the acquired list of broadcast services changes, a new list of services is acquired in the first database, and is copied to a second database when the entire list has been acquired in the first database.

Neither Klosterman nor Mansfield, Jr., whether taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest, *inter alia*, the aforementioned feature in which a new list of services is copied from a first database to a second database when the entire list has been acquired in the first database. In formulating the instant rejection, the Examiner admits that Klosterman fails to disclose the aforementioned feature, and relies on Mansfield, Jr. for allegedly disclosing it. In particular, the Examiner relies on column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 9 of Mansfield, Jr. for disclosing this feature (see pages 3-4 of

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Serial No. 09/806,393
Final OA Dated: April 9, 2007
Response dated: September 7, 2007

PATENT
PF980067

the Final Office Action dated April 9, 2007). Column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 9 of Mansfield, Jr. states:

"A data base snapshot is a copy of all or part of the data base that is isolated from update activity. Database snapshots are often used when a series of queries are to be processed and where the database must not change during the processing of those queries. Database snapshots are also used to permit simultaneous query processing against a copy of a database in situations where the processing capacity of the primary copy is utilized entirely to support transaction processing. Database snapshots may contain the entire database, or may contain a subset of the database as defined by specific selection predicates."

In response, Applicants note that the foregoing cited passage of Mansfield, Jr. is completely silent regarding the timing of the copying. Accordingly, the proposed combination including Mansfield, Jr. fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, the claimed feature of independent claims 8 and 15 in which a new list of services is copied from a first database to a second database when the entire list has been acquired in the first database. For this reason alone, the instant rejection should be withdrawn.

Applicants further note that the Examiner takes Official Notice regarding various issues related to the subject matter of claims 9-14 (see pages 4-6 of the final Office Action dated April 9, 2007). For example, the Examiner alleges that "it is notoriously well known to take the 'snapshot' of databases at different times under different circumstances." (see page 5 of the final Office Action dated April 9, 2007). In response, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's allegations and notes that the Examiner must either cite a reference to support his position, or withdrawal the rejection. In view of the foregoing remarks/arguments, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8-15.

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Serial No. 09/806,393
Final OA Dated: April 9, 2007
Response dated: September 7, 2007

PATENT
PF980067

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing remarks/arguments and accompanying amendments, the Applicants believe this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' attorney at (609) 734-6813, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Please charge the \$450 fee for the 2 Month Extension, and any other costs that may be associated with the filing of this response to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

LOUIS CHEVALLIER ET AL.

By:


Reitseng Lin
Reg. No. 42,804
Phone (609) 734-6813

RSL:pdf

Thomson Licensing LLC
Patent Operations
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312


September 7, 2007

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence (and any document referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on the date indicated below:

Date

September 10, 2007


Patricia M. Fedorowycz